

Can a Borel group be generated by a Hurewicz subspace?

Lyubomyr Zdomskyy

Abstract

In this paper we formulate three problems concerning topological properties of sets generating Borel non- σ -compact groups. In case of the concrete $F_{\sigma\delta}$ -subgroup of $\{0, 1\}^{\omega \times \omega}$ this gives an equivalent reformulation of the Scheepers diagram problem.

Introduction

The Hurewicz property was introduced in [5] as a cover counterpart of the σ -compactness: a topological space X is said to have this property, if for every sequence $(u_n)_{n \in \omega}$ of open covers of X there exists a sequence $(v_n)_{n \in \omega}$, where each v_n is a finite subset of u_n , such that each element $x \in X$ belongs to $\cup v_n$ for all but finitely many $n \in \omega$. It is easy to see that each σ -compact space is Hurewicz (= has the Hurewicz property). The converse statement is known to fail in ZFC, see [6]. By a *Borel* space we mean a separable metrizable space which is a Borel subset of its completion. This paper is devoted to problems close to the subsequent one.

Problem 1. *Can a Borel non- σ -compact group be generated by its Hurewicz subspace?*

This problem is especially interesting for the concrete subgroup G of $\{0, 1\}^{\omega \times \omega}$ (standardly endowed with the coordinatewise addition modulo 2) being equivalent to the “Hurewicz” part of the Scheepers diagram problem (see [6, Problems 1,2], [14, Problems 4.1,4.2], [12, Problem 1], and [13, Problem 3.2]), where

$$G = \{x \in \{0, 1\}^{\omega^2} : \text{for every } j \in \omega \text{ and for all but finitely many } i \in \omega \ (x_{i,j} = 0)\}.$$

In order to formulate the Scheepers diagram problem we have to recall some definitions. M. Scheepers in his work [10] introduced a long list of new properties looking similar to the Hurewicz one, and thus gave rise to the branch of set-theoretic topology known as *Selection Principles*. Selection principles may be thought as some combinatorial conditions on the family of open covers of a topological space. Let $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{B}$ be a families of covers of a topological space X . Following [10] we say that X has the property

- $\bigcup_{fin}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})$, if for every sequence $(u_n)_{n \in \omega} \in \mathcal{A}^\omega$ there exists a sequence $(v_n)_{n \in \omega}$, where each v_n is a finite subset of u_n , such that $\{\cup v_n : n \in \omega\} \in \mathcal{B}$;
- $S_{fin}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})$, if for every sequence $(u_n)_{n \in \omega} \in \mathcal{A}^\omega$ there exists a sequence $(v_n)_{n \in \omega}$, where each v_n is a finite subset of u_n , such that $\bigcup \{v_n : n \in \omega\} \in \mathcal{B}$.

⁰2000 Mathematics Subject Classification: 22-99, 54D20, 28A05.

Throughout the paper $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{B}$ run over the families $\mathcal{O}$, Ω , and Γ of all open (ω -, γ -) covers of X . Given a family $u = \{U_i : i \in I\}$ of subsets of a set X , we define the map $\mu_u : X \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(I)$ letting $\mu_u(x) = \{i \in I : x \in U_i\}$ (μ_u is nothing else but the Marczewski “dictionary” map introduced in [9]). In what follows $I \in \{\omega, \omega^2\}$. Depending on the properties of $\mu_u(X)$ a family $u = \{U_n : n \in \omega\}$ is defined to be

- an ω -cover [4], if the family $\mu_u(X)$ is centered, i.e. for every finite subset K of X the intersection $\bigcap_{x \in K} \mu_u(x)$ is infinite;
- a γ -cover of X [4], if for every $x \in X$ the set $\mu_u(x)$ is cofinite in ω , i.e. $\omega \setminus \mu_u(x)$ is finite.

We shall consider here four selection principles: $\bigcup_{fin}(\mathcal{O}, \Gamma)$, $\bigcup_{fin}(\mathcal{O}, \Omega)$, $\bigcup_{fin}(\mathcal{O}, \mathcal{O})$ and $S_{fin}(\Gamma, \Omega)$. Let us note that $\bigcup_{fin}(\mathcal{O}, \Gamma)$ is nothing else but the Hurewicz property. Concerning $\bigcup_{fin}(\mathcal{O}, \mathcal{O})$, it is the classical Menger covering property introduced in [8]. We are in a position now to formulate the

Scheepers diagram problem.

- (1) Does the property $\bigcup_{fin}(\mathcal{O}, \Omega)$ imply $S_{fin}(\Gamma, \Omega)$?
- (2) And if not, then does $\bigcup_{fin}(\mathcal{O}, \Gamma)$ imply $S_{fin}(\Gamma, \Omega)$?

One may ask the same question as in Problem 1 for properties $\bigcup_{fin}(\mathcal{O}, \Omega)$ and $\bigcup_{fin}(\mathcal{O}, \mathcal{O})$.

Problem 2. *Can a Borel non- σ -compact group be generated by its subspace with the property $\bigcup_{fin}(\mathcal{O}, \Omega)$?*

Problem 3. *Can a Borel non- σ -compact group be generated by its subspace with the property $\bigcup_{fin}(\mathcal{O}, \mathcal{O})$?*

The subsequent theorem, which is the main result of this paper, is the reformulation of a Scheepers diagram problem in algebraic manner.

Theorem 4. *The property $\bigcup_{fin}(\mathcal{O}, \Gamma)$ (resp. $\bigcup_{fin}(\mathcal{O}, \Omega)$, $\bigcup_{fin}(\mathcal{O}, \mathcal{O})$) implies $S_{fin}(\Gamma, \Omega)$ if and only if the group G is not generated by its subspace with the property $\bigcup_{fin}(\mathcal{O}, \Gamma)$ (resp. $\bigcup_{fin}(\mathcal{O}, \Omega)$, $\bigcup_{fin}(\mathcal{O}, \mathcal{O})$).*

In other words, the positive answer onto the Scheepers diagram problem (1) (resp. (2)) is equivalent to the negative answer onto Problem 2 (resp. Problem 1) in case of the group G .

The group G is a rather simple object from the point of view of Descriptive Set Theory. For every $j \in \omega$ its projection onto $\{0, 1\}^{\omega \times \{j\}}$ is homeomorphic to $\mathbb{Q}$ being a countable metrizable space without isolated points. From the above it follows that G is a countable intersection of F_σ subsets of $\{0, 1\}^{\omega^2}$ (i.e. it is an $F_{\sigma\delta}$ - or, equivalently, Π^0_3 - subset) homeomorphic to $\mathbb{Q}^\omega$. Therefore it is a nowhere locally-compact, and it fails to have the property $\bigcup_{fin}(\mathcal{O}, \mathcal{O})$. For more simple groups from the point of view of Borel hierarchy Problem 1 can be answered in negative.

Proposition 5. *No Borel non- σ -compact group B can be generated by its subspace X with the property $\bigcup_{fin}(\mathcal{O}, \Gamma)$ provided B is an F_σ - or G_δ - subspace of a complete metric space.*

Recall that a map f from a topological space X to a topological space Y is *Borel*, if for every Borel subset B of Y its preimage $f^{-1}(B)$ is a Borel subset of X . The subsequent statement answers Problem 3 in positive under the Continuum Hypothesis. On the other hand, it is known that the properties $\bigcup_{fin}(\mathcal{O}, \Omega)$ and $\bigcup_{fin}(\mathcal{O}, \mathcal{O})$ coincide in some models of ZFC, see [17]. Therefore the negative answer onto Problem 2 would imply that the negative answer onto Problem 3 is consistent as well.

Proposition 6. *Under the Continuum Hypothesis a metrizable separable group B can be generated by its subspace X with the property $\bigcup_{fin}(\mathcal{O}, \mathcal{O})$ provided it is a Borel homomorphic image of a nonmeager metrizable separable group. In particular, $\mathbb{G}$ is generated by its subspace with the property $\bigcup_{fin}(\mathcal{O}, \mathcal{O})$ under CH.*

Remark. None of the known methods of construction of spaces with the property $\bigcup_{fin}(\mathcal{O}, \Gamma)$ can give a subspace of a Borel non- σ -compact group generating it. All finite powers of spaces with the property $\bigcup_{fin}(\mathcal{O}, \Gamma)$ constructed in [6, Theorem 5.1], [15, Theorem 5.1], and [2, Theorem 10(1)] have the property $\bigcup_{fin}(\mathcal{O}, \mathcal{O})$ or even $\bigcup_{fin}(\mathcal{O}, \Gamma)$, and hence so is any group they generate. But every Borel (even analytic) space with the property $\bigcup_{fin}(\mathcal{O}, \mathcal{O})$ is σ -compact, see [1]. While the Sierpinski sets S considered in [6] and [11] have the subsequent property: for every Borel subset B containing S there exists a σ -compact L such that $S \subset L \subset B$, see [3].

Concerning the property $\bigcup_{fin}(\mathcal{O}, \Omega)$, all known examples (besides Sierpinski sets) have the property $\bigcup_{fin}(\mathcal{O}, \mathcal{O})$ in all finite powers, and hence can not generate non- σ -compact Borel group. $\square$

Proofs

In what follows $A \subset^* B$ standardly means that $A \setminus B$ is finite. In our proofs we shall exploit set-valued maps. By a *set-valued map* Φ from a set X into a set Y we understand a map from X into $\mathcal{P}(Y)$ and write $\Phi : X \Rightarrow Y$ (here $\mathcal{P}(Y)$ denotes the set of all subsets of Y). For a subset A of X we put $\Phi(A) = \bigcup_{x \in A} \Phi(x) \subset Y$. The set-valued map Φ between topological spaces X and Y is said to be

- *compact-valued*, if $\Phi(x)$ is compact for every $x \in X$;
- *upper semicontinuous*, if for every open subset V of Y the set $\Phi_{\subset}^{-1}(V) = \{x \in X : \Phi(x) \subset V\}$ is open in X .

For a set X we can identify $\mathcal{P}(X)$ with the compact space $\{0, 1\}^X$ via the map $X \supset A \mapsto \chi_A \in \{0, 1\}^X$ assigning to a subset of X its characteristic function. A family $\mathcal{A}$ of subsets of a set X is called *upward closed*, for every $A \in \mathcal{A}$ and $B \supset A$ we have $B \in \mathcal{A}$. For a set $A \subset X$ we make the subsequent notation: $\uparrow A = \{B \subset X : A \subset B\}$. The following lemma is a more convenient reformulation of Theorem 4.

Lemma 7. *Let $\mathbf{P}$ be a topological property preserved by images under upper semicontinuous compact-valued maps. Then the following conditions are equivalent:*

- (1) *The property $\mathbf{P}$ implies $S_{fin}(\Gamma, \Omega)$;*
- (2) *for every (upward-closed) $\mathcal{F} \subset \mathcal{P}(\omega^2)$ with the property $\mathbf{P}$ such that $\omega \times \{j\} \subset^* F$ for every $F \in \mathcal{F}$ and $j \in \omega$, there exists a sequence $(K_j)_{j \in \omega}$ of finite subsets of ω such that each element of the smallest filter containing $\mathcal{F}$ meets $\bigcup_{n \in \omega} K_j \times \{j\}$.*

Proof. (1) $\Rightarrow$ (2). It simply follows from definition of the property $S_{fin}(\Gamma, \Omega)$ and the observation that $\{\{F \in \mathcal{F} : F \ni (i, j)\} : i \in \omega\}$ is an open γ -cover of $\mathcal{F}$ for every $j \in \omega$.

(2) $\Rightarrow$ (1). Let X be a topological space with the property P and $(u_j)_{j \in \omega}$ be a sequence of open γ -covers of X . Let us write u_j in the form $u_j = \{U_{i,j} : i \in \omega\}$. Set $u = \{U_{i,j} : i, j \in \omega\}$. Consider the set-valued map $\Phi : X \Rightarrow \mathcal{P}(\omega^2)$, $\Phi : x \mapsto \uparrow \mu_u(x)$. Applying Lemma 2 of [17], we conclude that Φ is compact-valued and upper semicontinuous, and hence $\mathcal{F} := \Phi(X)$ has the property P . The definition of Φ implies that $\mathcal{F}$ is upward closed. Since u_j is a γ -cover of X for every $j \in \omega$, $\omega \times \{j\} \subset^* F$ for each $F \in \mathcal{F}$. From the above it follows that there exists a sequence $(K_j)_{j \in \omega}$ of finite subsets of ω such that each element of the smallest filter $\mathcal{U}$ containing $\mathcal{F}$ meets some $K_j \times \{j\}$. Then the family $\{U_{i,j} : i \in K_j\}$ is easily seen to be an ω -cover of X , which finishes our proof. $\square$

The properties $\bigcup_{fin}(\mathcal{O}, \mathcal{O})$, $\bigcup_{fin}(\mathcal{O}, \Omega)$, and $\bigcup_{fin}(\mathcal{O}, \Gamma)$ satisfy the conditions of the above lemma by [17, Lemma 1].

Proof of Theorem 4. Let P be any of the properties $\bigcup_{fin}(\mathcal{O}, \mathcal{O})$, $\bigcup_{fin}(\mathcal{O}, \Omega)$, and $\bigcup_{fin}(\mathcal{O}, \Gamma)$. Assuming that P implies $S_{fin}(\Gamma, \Omega)$, fix a subspace X of $\mathbf{G}$ with the property P . Let us denote by φ the map assigning to a subset A of ω^2 its characteristic function $\chi_A \in \{0, 1\}^{\omega^2}$. Then the space $\mathcal{F} = \{\omega^2 \setminus A : A \in \varphi^{-1}(X)\}$ has the property P being homeomorphic to X , and $\omega \times \{j\} \subset^* F$ for every $F \in \mathcal{F}$ by our choice of $\mathbf{G} \supset X$. Applying Lemma 7, we conclude that there exists a sequence $(K_j)_{j \in \omega}$ of finite subsets of ω such that $\bigcup_{j \in \omega} K_j \times \{j\}$ meets all elements of the smallest filter containing $\mathcal{F}$. Now, a direct verification shows that the characteristic function $\chi_{\bigcup_{j \in \omega} K_j \times \{j\}}$ can not be represented as a sum of elements of X , which means that X does not generate $\mathbf{G}$.

Next, let us assume that P does not imply $S_{fin}(\Gamma, \Omega)$ and apply Lemma 7 to find an upward closed family $\mathcal{F}$ of subsets of ω^2 such that for every sequence $(K_j)_{j \in \omega}$ of finite subsets of ω there exists a finite subset $\mathcal{A}$ of $\mathcal{F}$ such that

$$\left(\bigcup_{j \in \omega} K_j \times \{j\}\right) \cap \bigcap \mathcal{A} = \emptyset.$$

Set $X = \{\chi_{\omega^2 \setminus F} : F \in \mathcal{F}\}$. Then X has the property P being homeomorphic to $\mathcal{F}$. We claim that X is a set of generators of $\mathbf{G}$. Indeed, let us fix any $g \in \mathbf{G}$ and set $K_j = \{i \in \omega : g_{i,j} = 1\}$. Then each K_j is finite by the definition of $\mathbf{G}$. For the sequence $(K_j)_{j \in \omega}$ find a finite subset $\mathcal{A} = \{A_i : i \leq n\}$ of $\mathcal{F}$ as above. Using the upward closedness of $\mathcal{F}$, define inductively a finite subset $\mathcal{B} = \{B_i : i \leq n\}$ of $\mathcal{F}$ letting $B_0 = A_0$ and $B_k = A_k \cup \bigcup_{l < k} (\omega^2 \setminus B_l)$ for all $0 < k \leq n$. It is easy to prove by induction over $k \leq n$ that $(\omega^2 \setminus B_l) \cap (\omega^2 \setminus B_k) = \emptyset$ for all $l < k$ and $\bigcap_{l < k} B_k = \bigcap_{l \leq k} A_k$, consequently $\bigcap \mathcal{B} = \bigcap \mathcal{A} \subset (\omega^2 \setminus \bigcup_{j \in \omega} K_j \times \{j\})$. Let $C_k = B_k \cup (\omega^2 \setminus \bigcup_{j \in \omega} K_j \times \{j\})$, $k \leq n$. Then $\mathcal{C} = \{C_k : k \leq n\}$ has the following properties

$$(i) \quad \bigcup \mathcal{C} = \omega^2 \setminus \bigcup_{j \in \omega} K_j \times \{j\};$$

$$(ii) \quad (\omega^2 \setminus C) \cap (\omega^2 \setminus D) = \emptyset \text{ for all } C, D \in \mathcal{C};$$

$$(iii) \quad \mathcal{C} \subset \mathcal{F}.$$

It suffices to note that $\{\chi_{\omega^2 \setminus C_k} : k \leq n\} \subset X$ by (iii) and $\chi_{\omega^2 \setminus C_0} + \cdots + \chi_{\omega^2 \setminus C_n} = \chi_{\bigcup_{j \in \omega} K_j \times \{j\}} = g$, which finishes our proof. $\square$

Proof of Proposition 5. First assume that B is a non- σ -compact G_δ -subspace of a complete metric space and fix a subspace X of B with the property $\bigcup_{fin}(\mathcal{O}, \Gamma)$. The same argument as in [6, Theorem 5.7] gives a σ -compact subset L of B such that $X \subset L$. Since B is not σ -compact, it is not generated by L , and hence by X as well.

Now consider a non- σ -compact Borel group B which is an F_σ -subset of a complete metric space Y and write B in the form $\bigcup_{n \in \omega} B_n$, where each B_n is closed in Y . Let X be a subspace of B with the property $\bigcup_{fin}(\mathcal{O}, \Gamma)$. Since the property $\bigcup_{fin}(\mathcal{O}, \Gamma)$ is preserved by closed subspaces, $X \cap B_n$ has the property $\bigcup_{fin}(\mathcal{O}, \Gamma)$ for all $n \in \omega$. In addition, each B_n is a G_δ -subspace of Y being closed. From the above it follows that there exists a σ -compact L_n such that $X \cap B_n \subset L_n \subset B_n$, and consequently $X \subset \bigcup_{n \in \omega} L_n \subset B$. It suffices to apply the same argument as in the first part of the proof. $\square$

Proof of Proposition 6. Let C be a nonmeager metrizable separable topological group and $f : C \rightarrow B$ be a surjective Borel homomorphism. Almost literal repetition of the proof of Lemma 29 from [11] give us a subspace Z of C such that Z generates C and each Borel image of Z has the property $\bigcup_{fin}(\mathcal{O}, \mathcal{O})$, see [11, Corollary 30]. It suffices to note that B is generated by $f(Z)$.

Next, let us show that under CH the group G is generated by its subspace with the property $\bigcup_{fin}(\mathcal{O}, \mathcal{O})$. Indeed, let us denote by τ the Tychonoff product topology on $\{0, 1\}^{\omega^2} = \prod_{j \in \omega} \{0, 1\}^{\omega \times \{j\}}$, where $\{0, 1\}^{\omega \times \{j\}}$ is considered with the discrete topology for each $j \in \omega$. Then $\tau|G$ is stronger than the natural topology on G , and $(G, \tau|G)$ is a completely metrizable topological group being a countable product of countable discrete groups. $\square$

Acknowledgements. The author wishes to express his thanks to professor Taras Banach for supervising the writing of this paper.

References

- [1] Arhangel'skiĭ A.V., *Hurewicz spaces, analytic sets, and fan tightness of function spaces*, Soviet Mathematical Doklady **33** (1986), 396–399.
- [2] Bartoszyński T., Tsaban B., *Hereditary Topological Diagonalizations and the Menger-Hurewicz Conjectures*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc., to appear. <http://arxiv.org/abs/math.LO/0208224>
- [3] Banach T., Zdomskyy L., *Separation properties between σ -compactness and the Hurewicz property*, in progress.
- [4] Gerlits J., Nagy Zs., *Some properties of $C(X)$, I*, Topology Appl. **14** (2) (1982), 151–163.
- [5] Hurewicz W., *Über Folgen stetiger Functionen*, Fund. Math. **9** (1927), 193–204.
- [6] Just W., Miller A., Scheepers M., Szeptycki S., *The combinatorics of open covers II*, Topology Appl. **73** (1996), 241–266.
- [7] Kechris A., *Classical Descriptive Set Theory*, Grad. Texts in Math. **156**, Springer, 1995.

- [8] Menger K., *Einige Überdeckungssätze der Punktmengenlehre*, *Sitzungsberichte. Abt. 2a, Mathematic, Astronomie, Physic, Meteorologie und Mechanic* (Wiener Akademie) **133** (1924) 421– 444.
- [9] Marczewski E. (Szpilrajn), *The characteristic function of a sequence of sets and some of its applications*, *Fund. Math.* **31** (1938), 207–233.
- [10] Scheepers M., *Combinatorics of open covers I: Ramsey Theory*, *Topology Appl.* **69** (1996), 31–62.
- [11] Scheepers M., Tsaban B., *The combinatorics of Borel covers*, *Topology and Appl.* **121** (2002) 357–382.
- [12] Tsaban B., *Selection principles in mathematics: A milestone of open problems*, *Note Mat.* **22:2** (2003/2004), 179–208.
<http://arxiv.org/abs/math.GN/0312182>
- [13] Tsaban B., *Some new directions in infinite- combinatorial topology*, submitted.
<http://arxiv.org/abs/math.GN/0409069>
- [14] Tsaban B., (eds.),
SPM Bulletin **2** (2003) <http://arxiv.org/abs/math.GN/0302062>
- [15] Tsaban B., Zdomskyy L., *Scales, Fields, and a problem of Hurewicz*, submitted to J. Amer. Math. Soc.. <http://arxiv.org/abs/math.GN/0507043>.
- [16] Vaughan J., *Small uncountable cardinals and topology*, in *Open problems in topology* (J. van Mill, G.M. Reed, Eds.), Elsevier Sci. Publ., Amsterdam, 1990, pp. 195–218.
- [17] Zdomskyy L., *A semifilter approach to selection principles*, *Comment. Math. Univ. Carolin.* **46** (2005), 525–540. <http://arxiv.org/abs/math.GN/0412498>

Department of Mechanics and Mathematics,
Ivan Franko Lviv National University,
Universytetska 1, Lviv, 79000, Ukraine.

E-mail address: lzdomsky@rambler.ru